



Access to supplemental educational services in the Central Region states



Institute of Education Sciences

U.S. Department of Education




Access to supplemental educational services in the Central Region states

July 2007

Prepared by

Zoe Barley, Ph.D.

Sandra K. Wegner, Ed.D.



Issues & Answers is an ongoing series of reports from short-term Fast Response Projects conducted by the regional educational laboratories on current education issues of importance at local, state, and regional levels. Fast Response Project topics change to reflect new issues, as identified through lab outreach and requests for assistance from policymakers and educators at state and local levels and from communities, businesses, parents, families, and youth. All Issues & Answers reports meet Institute of Education Sciences standards for scientifically valid research.

July 2007

This report was prepared for the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) under Contract ED-06-CO-0023 by Regional Educational Laboratory Central administered by Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

This report is in the public domain. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, it should be cited as:

Barley, Z., & Wegner, S. K. (2007). *Access to supplemental educational services in the Central Region states* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 007). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Central. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

This report is available on the regional educational laboratory web site at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

Summary

Access to supplemental educational services in the Central Region states

At just 11 percent of eligible students, participation rates in supplemental educational services—available in schools that fail to make adequate progress for three years running—are low and may not improve until provision problems are resolved and programs demonstrate effectiveness. Answers to five research questions provide a status report.

The Central Region states lag behind the nation in participation in the supplemental educational services that schools failing to make adequate progress for three consecutive years must offer to eligible students under the No Child Left Behind Act. Information from databases and from interviews with state education agency contacts is used to examine five topics about the program: its status in the Central Region, service providers, evaluation of provider programs, implementation roles, and key state agency concerns.

During the 2004/05 school year 131 schools in 52 school districts in the Central Region were required to offer supplemental educational services. Of 47,065 eligible students only 5,080 (11 percent) participated. Four of the region's

seven states have fewer service providers than the national average. One in four eligible schools in the Central Region is rural, and access to providers in rural areas was identified as an important issue for service provision. Four states reported difficulty recruiting providers for rural schools.

Providers tell state education agency contacts that they cannot afford to offer services in isolated rural areas where low student density causes a large increase in per pupil cost. State contacts also report that service provision is complicated by parental resistance to using outside providers in some rural settings and lack of access to the Internet for online services.

State agency contacts report taking their provision and oversight roles seriously but believe that they lack the resources and ability to prioritize the provision of supplemental services among their other responsibilities. Districts and schools have on-the-ground information about participation, but their roles do not include evaluating providers. Monitoring and evaluating providers in the Central Region is just getting under way. There are concerns

about the adequacy of staff time and expertise to produce the kind of evaluative information that will ensure that the services provided are effective.

The low rates of participation in supplemental educational services reported by the Central Region states may not improve until participants are convinced that the services will boost student learning. Models for service provision to rural schools with fewer eligible

students are needed. Research is also needed to determine the effectiveness of particular providers and the effectiveness and cost-benefit ratios of various delivery models.

Planned follow-up descriptive studies will indicate which of these tentative conclusions prove persistent and which change as the program develops.

July 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	iii
Overview	1
What the study tried to do—and what it didn't	2
Research question 1: How do central region states describe their supplemental educational services programs?	2
Ethnicity composition in eligible schools and districts differs from the regional average	3
Most eligible schools and students are in urban areas—most eligible districts are in rural areas	4
Research question 2: What service providers have been approved, and are their services available to eligible students?	5
Availability of supplemental educational services providers varies by urban-rural location	5
Provider characteristics are fairly uniform	6
Quality and appropriateness of providers are difficult to assess	8
Research question 3: Are supplemental educational services providers being monitored and evaluated?	8
Evaluation is challenging and current status varies by state	8
Monitoring involves a moderate to high degree of challenge in most states	9
Research question 4: How are the states carrying out supplemental educational services?	11
The roles of state education agencies are challenging	11
The roles of districts and schools as liaisons between other key parties	12
The roles of parents are not yet being fully realized	13
Research question 5: What are the issues and concerns for the Central Region states in implementing supplemental educational services?	14
Concerns about funding	14
Concerns about flexibility	14
Concerns about cross-level relationships	14
Notes	14
Appendix A Data collection and analysis	16
Appendix B Interview protocol	18
References	21
Bibliography	22
Boxes	
1 Supplemental educational services and the No Child Left Behind Act	2
2 Data collection and limitations of the data	3
Tables	
1 Central Region participation in supplemental services is far below eligibility rates	4
2 Student ethnicity in eligible Central Region districts and schools varies from the regional average	4

3	Share of eligible districts and schools by urban-rural location	5
4	Number of supplemental educational services providers in the Central Region by state	5
5	For-profit organizations predominate among supplemental economic services providers in the Central Region states	6
6	Delivery modality used by supplemental educational services providers, by state	7
7	All the Central Region states have at least three supplemental educational services providers providing services in reading and mathematics	7
8	Supplemental educational services supporting materials provided by states	10

At just 11 percent of eligible students, participation rates in supplemental educational services—available in schools that fail to make adequate progress for three years running—are low and may not improve until provision problems are resolved and programs demonstrate effectiveness. Answers to five research questions provide a status report.

OVERVIEW

The Central Region states (Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming) lag behind the nation in the rate of participation in supplemental educational services that schools failing to make adequate progress for three consecutive years must offer to eligible students under the No Child Left Behind Act (box 1). This study uses information from databases and from interviews with state education agency contacts to examine five topics about the program: its status in the Central Region, service providers, evaluation of provider programs, implementation roles, and key state agency concerns.

During the 2004/05 school year 131 schools in 52 school districts in the Central Region were required to offer supplemental educational services. Of 47,065 eligible students only 5,080 (11 percent) participated. Four of the region's seven states have fewer service providers than the national average. One in four eligible schools in the Central Region is rural, and access to providers in rural areas was identified as an important issue for service provision. Four states reported difficulty recruiting providers for rural schools.

Providers tell state education agency contacts that they cannot afford to offer services in isolated rural areas where low student density causes a large increase in per pupil cost. State contacts also report that service provision is complicated by parental resistance to using outside providers in some rural settings and lack of access to the Internet for online services.

State agency contacts take their provision and oversight work on the provision of supplemental services seriously but lack the resources and ability to prioritize it among their other responsibilities. Districts and schools have on-the-ground information about participation, but their roles do not include resolving issues of access to providers and the effectiveness of their services. Monitoring and evaluating providers in the Central Region is just getting under way. There are concerns about the

adequacy of staff time and expertise to produce the kind of evaluative information that will ensure that the services provided are effective.

The low rates of participation in supplemental educational services reported by the Central Region states may not improve until participants are convinced that the services will boost student learning. Models for service provision to rural schools with low numbers of eligible students are needed. Research is also needed to determine the effectiveness of particular providers and the effectiveness and cost-benefit ratios of various delivery models.

WHAT THE STUDY TRIED TO DO—AND WHAT IT DIDN'T

This report on the role of the seven Central Region states in overseeing the supplemental educational services program is based on secondary analyses of online databases and confirming interviews with contacts in the state departments of education (see box 2 and appendix A for details). A descriptive study, it looks at how the seven states of the Central Region are implementing the program mainly from the perspective of the state education agency staff member in charge of each state's program. It offers a status report for policymakers and technical assistance providers as the program continues to get under way. Follow-up studies will

compare the perceptions of state agency personnel with parent perceptions and school data to further assess the impact of the program on students.

Five research questions guided the investigation:

- 1. How do Central Region states describe their supplemental educational services programs?
- 2. What service providers have been approved, and are their services available to eligible students?
- 3. Are supplemental educational services providers being monitored and evaluated?
- 4. How are the Central Region states implementing supplemental educational services?
- 5. What are the issues and concerns for the Central Region states in implementing supplemental educational services?

Planned follow-up descriptive studies will indicate which of this study's tentative conclusions prove persistent and which change as the program develops.

**RESEARCH QUESTION 1:
HOW DO CENTRAL REGION STATES DESCRIBE THEIR
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES PROGRAMS?**

During the 2004/05 school year 131 schools in 52 school districts in the Central Region were

BOX 1

Supplemental educational services and the No Child Left Behind Act

The intent of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 is to ensure that all children succeed in school. Schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress for three consecutive years are required to make available school transfer options and supplemental educational services to their low-income students (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2006). Parents

can access free instructional support services that provide their children with extra help in subjects such as reading and mathematics outside regular school hours. Supplemental services must be of high quality, research based, designed to increase academic achievement, capable of helping students attain proficiency in meeting state academic achievement standards, consistent with the content and instruction used by the local education agency, and aligned with the state's academic content standards.

Supplemental services can be provided by a variety of entities, including non-profit groups, for-profit companies, local community programs, private schools, charter schools, national organizations, faith-based groups, public schools and districts, and colleges or universities—but providers must be approved by the state before offering services. The supplemental educational services provision of the act requires support and active participation from parents, districts, and states, defining the role each should play.

BOX 2

Data collection and limitations of the data

Data collection. Data were collected on the supplemental educational services programs for the seven Central Region states for the 2004/05 report year from national databases (see appendix A) to determine which districts and schools were required to offer supplemental services. State databases were also reviewed. In addition, several analyses using national and state databases to describe supplemental programs were consulted, including a recent U.S. Government Accountability Office (2006) survey of districts with schools required to offer supplemental educational services. Researchers for that study gathered data, visited

school districts, interviewed 22 supplemental educational services providers, reviewed research on supplemental educational services, and interviewed federal Department of Education staff.

School characteristics were identified and analyzed, and a list was compiled of the characteristics of the supplemental educational services providers operating in the Central Region states. State education agencies were asked to verify the information, to further elaborate on the supplemental educational services system, and to discuss issues and concerns (see appendix B for details of the interview protocol).

Data limitations. This report is based on secondary analyses of online

databases and confirming interviews with contact people in state departments of education.

An impediment to conducting this study was the inability to find complete data sets for the Central Region states, while the qualitative data are strictly the perceptions of the state contacts in the field. The U.S. Government Accountability Office (2004) study *Improvement Needed in Education's Process for Tracking States' Implementation of Key Provisions* found that more than half the state and school district officials interviewed were not able to make wise decisions because of inadequate data. The current study indicates that the availability of complete and accurate databases continues to be a problem for the Central Region states.

required to offer supplemental educational services (table 1). Of 47,065 eligible students only 5,080 (11 percent) participated. The number of eligible students per state ranged from 1,048 to 26,942. Wyoming reported no schools on the needs improvement list for 2004/05, so information on Wyoming is not included in this section. Among the other Central Region states participation rates averaged 8 percent and ranged from 0 percent to 22 percent.¹

According to Stullich et al. (2006), 17 percent of eligible students participated in supplemental education programs in 2003/04. The Center for Education Policy (2006) reported that an average of about 18 percent of eligible students received supplemental services nationally for the 2004/05 school year. A U.S. Government Accountability Office report (2006) estimated that 19 percent of eligible students received services. All of these estimates are larger than all but one of the state participation rates in the Central Region. The low regional participation rate is a

matter of concern if the intent of the law is to be realized.

Ethnicity composition in eligible schools and districts differs from the regional average

While lack of data on individual students prevents establishing the ethnicity of the eligible student population, it was possible to establish the ethnicity composition of eligible districts and schools (table 2). The group with the largest share in eligible schools was American Indian/Alaskan Native (31 percent), followed by white (25 percent), Hispanic (23 percent), and black (19 percent). The Asian/Pacific Islander group (1 percent) had the smallest share of students in eligible schools. Eligible schools often did not share the same characteristics as their parent districts, with fewer white students and more Hispanic and black students than in the districts as a whole. For each of the ethnic minority groups except American Indian/Alaskan Native and for low-income students the share in eligible schools was much higher than the overall share in the region.

TABLE 1

Central Region participation in supplemental services is far below eligibility rates

State	Number			Students participating	Participation rate (percent)
	Schools	Districts	Eligible students		
Colorado	64	16	26,942	2,993	11
Kansas	6	4	4,661	319	7
Missouri	21	9	6,978	1,515	22
Nebraska	10	8	1,048	0	0
North Dakota	11	6	2,653	197	7
South Dakota	19	9	4,783	56	1
Wyoming ^a	0	0	0	0	—
Total	131	52	47,065	5,080	11

a. Wyoming reported no districts on the needs improvement list.

Source: Interviews with supplemental educational services state contacts (August 2006).

TABLE 2

Student ethnicity in eligible Central Region districts and schools varies from the regional average (percent)

Student ethnicity	Average for all schools	Eligible districts ^a		Eligible schools ^b	
		Percent	Range	Percent	Range
American Indian/Alaskan Native	4	34	< 1–94	31	< 1–95
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	0.8	< 1–8	1.2	< 1–2
Black	7	11	< 1–75	19	< 1–59
Hispanic	9	12	< 1–38	23	< 1–69
White	78	42	6–75	25	3–53
Low-income students	34	66	46–83	76	61–82

a. Economically disadvantaged.

b. Free and reduced price lunch.

Source: Central Region state education agency web sites and National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved July 2, 2006, from <http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/>.

Most eligible schools and students are in urban areas—most eligible districts are in rural areas

While only 28 percent of districts containing eligible schools are classified as “large city” or “urban fringe” these encompassed more than half of eligible schools (58 percent; table 3). Rural settings accounted for 33 percent of eligible districts in the region but only 27 percent of eligible schools. These numbers may reflect the fact that small towns and rural districts typically contain fewer

schools, so one eligible school, representing a large share of the student population, is likely to result in a district being designated as eligible.

Three Central Region states (Colorado, Missouri, and South Dakota) are currently developing systems that will make individual student data available. These data should enable future reports from the Central Region to be more informative about the nature of the eligible student population and the groups being reached.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2: WHAT SERVICE PROVIDERS HAVE BEEN APPROVED, AND ARE THEIR SERVICES AVAILABLE TO ELIGIBLE STUDENTS?

The requirement to provide supplemental educational services for schools in need of improvement is still relatively new, and the number and type of providers continue to change as more schools become eligible for services. This report describes current access and providers. Follow-up reports will establish trends across time, looking at an established group of providers and linking providers and individual students.

For the 2004/05 school year 164 supplemental educational services providers were approved, ranging from 3 to 43 among the seven states (table 4). Nationally, the number of providers averaged 20 per state, with a large increase in providers in the previous two years (Center on Education Policy, 2006). The state contacts interviewed for this study said that the Central Region did not experience similar growth. Data are not available on the number of students each provider serves.

Availability of supplemental educational services providers varies by urban-rural location

The availability of providers in each state is in part related to a state's recruiting effort. Four states (Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Wyoming) had difficulty recruiting providers, especially local providers in areas with a low number of eligible students. The state contacts believed that the low number of eligible students meant that not-for-profit providers would have difficulty covering costs, while for-profit providers would not find it profitable. State contacts noted that many less populous rural areas that were having difficulty recruiting providers had not attracted for-profit tutoring programs before the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act. All seven state agency contacts indicated that rural areas of their states were more likely to have less choice among providers—or no choice.

TABLE 3

Share of eligible districts and schools by urban-rural location

Location	Districts	Schools	Students
Large city	13	43	52
Urban fringe	15	15	14
Mid-size city	12	6	13
Small town	27	8	6
Rural	33	27	16

Source: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved July 2, 2006, from <http://nces.ed.gov/globallocator/>.

TABLE 4

Number of supplemental educational services providers in the Central Region by state

State	Number of providers
Colorado	43
Kansas	28
Missouri	56
Nebraska	3
North Dakota	12
South Dakota	19
Wyoming	3
Total	164

Source: Central Region state education agency web sites.

State agency contacts in two states (North Dakota and Wyoming) told of providers that did not apply because they could not provide sufficient evidence to meet the “research-based” and “financially sound” portions of the provider application. State contacts believed that this is particularly difficult for smaller, local applicants that might serve rural schools. The three states (Colorado, Missouri, and South Dakota) with no trouble recruiting providers reported being most successful in recruiting when they let districts help recruit, when they hosted recruitment fairs, and when they provided professional development for providers.

Four states had difficulty recruiting providers, especially local providers in areas with low student participation rates

State contacts also indicated that the number of provider applications was declining. In three states the contacts reported that 3–10 of their providers were not reapplying. The providers cited low student participation rates as the reason, indicating that they would need more students to make their presence in those states profitable.

State contacts in five states (Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming) considered their state’s rural composition as disadvantage in attracting supplemental educational services providers. State contacts believed that parents in rural areas were not accustomed to thinking that their children’s education could be enhanced by an outside agency, and therefore they chose not to participate in supplemental educational services programs when notified of the opportunity. Lack of access to the Internet, discussed later, is also perceived to create an access problem for rural areas.

State contacts also indicated that the number of provider applications was declining

In contrast, contacts reported that larger cities already tended to have an strong presence of for-profit agencies that were providing services to children before passage of the No Child Left Behind Act. Although participation was low everywhere in the Central Region states, state contacts believed that there was more provider involvement in larger population centers.

Provider characteristics are fairly uniform

The state contacts described the characteristics of current Central Region providers in their states by type of organization (public or for-profit); delivery modality (home, school, Internet); curriculum content areas (math and reading); grade levels; and provider costs (hourly rates). Because participating students cannot be identified and linked to specific providers, the state-approved providers described in this section are not necessarily serving eligible students at present. Rather, they are a part of a pool from which eligible students are or could be selecting services.

Type of organization. Nationally, private firms account for 76 percent of supplemental educational services providers (Stullich et al., 2006), a lower share than in all but two of the Central Region states. Only Kansas and Missouri have fewer than 90 percent for-profit providers. Overall, for-profit providers accounted for 80 percent of providers in the region, local public schools for 12 percent, and colleges and universities for 9 percent (table 5). Although many other types of nonprofits provide services nationally (for example, regional educational service agencies, community-based organizations, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers), state contacts reported nonprofit providers only from among schools, colleges, and universities. Given the predominance of for-profit providers, the

TABLE 5
For-profit organizations predominate among supplemental economic services providers in the Central Region states (number)

Provider type	Colorado	Kansas	Missouri	Nebraska	North Dakota	South Dakota	Wyoming	Total
For-profit	39 (91)	20 (71)	36 (64)	3 (100)	11 (92)	19 (100)	3 (100)	131 (80)
Public schools	1 (2)	3 (11)	15 (27)	0	0	0	0	19 (12)
Colleges, universities, and other public institutions	3 (7)	5 (18)	5 (9)	0	1	0	0	14 (9)
Total	43	28	56	3	12	19	3	164 (100)

Note: Numbers in parentheses are percentage shares.
Source: Central Region state education agency web sites.

descriptive material that follows is applicable primarily to for-profit providers.

Delivery modality. According to state education agency web sites, supplemental educational services providers offer programming in the school, a provider-designated site, over the Internet, and in the student's home (table 6). Across the Central Region 33 percent of providers served the students at their own school site and 16 percent used Internet-based instruction. According to the state agency contact in Wyoming, where instruction is strongly Internet-based, parents in one school had no access to tutoring for their children because they lacked access to the needed technology. The state agency contact for Nebraska expressed concern that even when computer access was

available, parents were not selecting Internet providers because of a general lack of knowledge or experience with online instruction.

Overall, for-profit providers accounted for 80 percent of providers in the region

Curriculum content. Of the supplemental educational services providers in the Central Region, 83 percent offer services in mathematics and reading, 14 percent in reading only, and 3 percent in mathematics only (table 7). All states have at least three providers assisting in reading and mathematics.

Grade levels and special needs students. All grade levels were served in the Central Region during the

TABLE 6

Delivery modality used by supplemental educational services providers, by state

Site	Colorado	Kansas	Missouri	Nebraska	North Dakota	South Dakota	Wyoming	Total	
								Number	Share (percent)
School	12	14	28					54	33
Provider's site	4		10	2		10	1	27	16
Internet	3	3	3		7	8	2	26	16
All of the above	17	11	14	1	5			48	29
Home	6		1			1		8	5
Total	42 ^a	28	56	3	12	19	3	163	100

a. Information not available for one Colorado site.

Source: Central Region state education agency web sites.

TABLE 7

All the Central Region states have at least three supplemental educational services providers providing services in reading and mathematics

Content area	Colorado	Kansas	Missouri	Nebraska	North Dakota	South Dakota	Wyoming	Total	
								Number	Share (percent)
Reading and mathematics	33	22	50	3	6	14	3	131	83
Reading	9	3	6		1	3		22	14
Mathematics	1	2				1		4	3
Total	43	27	56	3	7	18	3	157	100

Note: Information not available for all providers.

Source: Central Region state education agency web sites.

report year; however, the availability of services for special needs groups was limited in some states and districts. Of the 97 providers with information available about 38 percent offered services for special needs students, and 13 percent were able to give special assistance to students with limited English proficiency in the student's native language or through interpretation. While the review of web sites for providers suggests appropriate coverage, interviews with the state agency contacts indicated that some districts still had difficulty obtaining supplemental educational services at the appropriate grade level.

Hourly rates. The web site review and interviews with state agency contacts indicated a wide range in hourly rates for tutoring, ranging from \$8.50 to \$60.00 per hour. According to the Colorado state contact, some providers were charging \$60.00 per hour per child in group sessions, so costs for a group of five students reached \$300.00 per hour. State contacts had expected lower individual costs in groups. The fact that costs are not regulated was noted as a cause for concern.

Quality and appropriateness of providers are difficult to assess

The No Child Left Behind Act calls for high quality, research-based services, among other characteristics of supplemental educational services. Most provider web sites focused on client testimonials to substantiate their effectiveness. While testimonials are useful to a degree, more systematic measures of quality are needed. All the state agency contacts indicated that their best screen for quality was the provider application. All states used a committee of district and school personnel to assist in reviewing these applications.

State agency contacts indicated that some districts still had difficulty obtaining supplemental educational services at the appropriate grade level

Overall, according to the state agency contacts, problems remain in ensuring the availability and appropriateness of providers of supplemental educational services in the Central Region, especially

in rural areas. The cost of services is a problem both for providers that can enroll only small numbers of eligible students in smaller districts and for some districts that anticipate higher costs as more schools become eligible. While the Internet could improve access for rural students, not all parents are prepared for their children to use the Internet.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3: ARE SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES PROVIDERS BEING MONITORED AND EVALUATED?

The process of monitoring and evaluating supplemental educational services providers is just getting under way in the Central Region. There are concerns about the adequacy of staff time and lack of background in this new program to produce the kind of evaluation information that will ensure that the services are effective. Future reports will provide a more complete picture of monitoring and evaluation of the supplemental educational services program.

Evaluation is challenging and current status varies by state

Little information is available on monitoring and evaluation of supplemental educational services providers. State contacts indicated varying stages of implementation for their evaluation and monitoring programs. South Dakota used site visits for monitoring. Colorado state contacts indicated that school administrators conducted interviews and reported the results to them informally. At least two state agency contacts indicated that they had developed evaluation surveys for schools, parents, and eligible students to complete during the 2005/06 school year but did not yet have the results.

The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (2004) reported that evaluation requires several key components, including establishing compliance with No Child Left Behind and other laws; documenting student achievement outcomes; determining participants' satisfaction with providers; assessing collaboration among families, schools, and providers; determining the level of

administration by the schools; and ensuring that the needs of the students are met. The Council of Chief State School Officers has developed a toolkit for state education agencies that includes monitoring and evaluation; currently, however, it deals primarily with recruiting providers.

In *From the Capital to the Classroom: State and Federal Efforts to Implement the No Child Left Behind Act* (2006, p. 70), the Center on Education Policy stated

since supplemental education services are only one part of the educational process that could affect learning and achievement, it will be difficult to identify whether a particular service actually improves student achievement, and if so, to what extent. States face a challenge in figuring out how to isolate this part of the educational process.

To separate the effects of supplemental educational services on student achievement from other influences, states will need to conduct an extensive evaluation that isolates the contributions of supplemental services. Three states (Colorado, Missouri, and South Dakota) are developing databases that track individual students. Whether they will use these to analyze the effects of supplemental educational services is not clear.

The Center on Innovation and Improvement (2006) reviewed state web sites to create a state by state directory of support documents and communication tools in place to implement the supplemental educational services program (table 8).² This information could be used to identify areas in which state agencies might collaborate or tools they might adapt for their own use. In addition, Central Region technical assistance providers, such as comprehensive centers, might use the information to identify areas in which states lack the necessary tools.

In Colorado sample materials were available for districts to notify parents of students' eligibility for

supplemental educational services and to contract with providers. A searchable list of providers was available for district use. The provider application was available, but no evaluation plan was reported. Data collection materials for assessing student and parent satisfaction were not available.

In Kansas provider application materials were also available, and a provider list for district use was in place. A data survey had been developed for collecting evaluation data during 2005, and outlines for required district and provider reports were provided. Missouri and Nebraska were at the same level of readiness as Kansas, except that they had not yet developed a data survey or report outlines.

North Dakota prepared more extensive materials for districts to use in notifying parents and explaining the program. The provider list was available for district use, as were provider application materials and a scoring rubric for state personnel to assess provider applications. An evaluation process was defined.

South Dakota was farthest along in its documentation efforts. The state made available to schools and districts sample parent and student surveys, sample provider contracts, and sample letters to parents based on samples from other states. A provider list and provider application were available to districts. For evaluation South Dakota established a policy for removal of providers and required an end-of-year report.

To separate the effects of supplemental educational services on student achievement from other influences, states will need to conduct an extensive evaluation that isolates the contributions of supplemental services

Monitoring involves a moderate to high degree of challenge in most states

State agency contacts were asked to report the level of challenge associated with monitoring their supplemental educational services providers on a

TABLE 8

Supplemental educational services supporting materials provided by states

Supporting materials	Colorado	Kansas	Missouri	Nebraska	North Dakota	South Dakota	Wyoming
School satisfaction survey	—	—	—	—	—	• Sample toolkits	—
Parent satisfaction survey	—	—	—	—	—	• Sample parent and school survey (Wisconsin) • Parent, school, and student surveys (Oregon)	—
Supplemental educational services agreement (local education agency and provider for specific student)	• Sample contract for providers and districts	—	—	—	• Supplemental educational services agreement list	• Sample district contract • Supplemental educational services agreement (Wisconsin) • Sample contract (Washington)	—
Notice to parents	• Sample parent letter in English and Spanish	• Parent right to know in PDF	• Copy of notice	—	• Brochure • Sample letter • Sample participant form • Sample eligibility letter	• Three sample letters to parents	—
List of providers	• Districts' searchable providers list	• Provider list	• Provider list and summary of services	• Provider list	Provider list	• Provider list and information by district	—
Provider evaluation	—	• 2005 data survey and district and provider reports	—	—	• Evaluation process forms for program improvement requirements	• Policy for removal • End-of-year report	—
Provider application	• Application in PDF and Microsoft Word	• Application in PDF • Code of ethics • Rubric in Microsoft Excel	• Application • Scoring rubric	• Application in PDF	• Application in PDF • Instructions in Microsoft Word • Scoring rubric	• Application in PDF	• Available on request

— not available.

Source: Center on Innovation and Improvement, Directory of state contacts and web links, supplemental educational services. Retrieved July 24, 2006, from <http://www.centerii.org>.

scale of 1 (not at all challenging) to 4 (high degree of challenge). Four states (Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, and South Dakota) reported a high degree of challenge, while North Dakota and Wyoming indicated a moderate degree of challenge. Nebraska did not respond. Each contact was also asked to rate the components of the monitoring and evaluation requirements according to degree of challenge. These components were implementing the monitoring system and determining whether the provider services were effective in raising achievement. The least challenging aspect for the states is offering guidance for providers on the pricing and location of services.

No evaluative data were available from states at the time of the study to determine the effectiveness of the supplemental educational services providers. Asked to report specific difficulties that both the states and the districts were having in implementing a system for monitoring and evaluating supplemental educational services providers, state contacts cited lack of human resources capacity as a common theme. State agency contacts dedicated a reported 10–100 percent of their time administering this portion of the law.³ Only one contact person worked on the supplemental educational services program full time; the others indicated that responsibilities for monitoring and evaluating the program were added to their current job.

As a partial solution to the human resources issue, six state contacts indicated that they were either hiring a consultant or discussing the need for a consultant with their directors. Consultants would be used to develop software to track student participation and record parent and student satisfaction data. In most cases state contacts also wanted the consultants to take on monitoring and disaggregating program data for reporting. Three states (Colorado, Missouri, and South Dakota) are developing software programs that would assign an identification number to each student for data collection purposes. The system could then be used to report the frequency and duration of sessions, the provider used, and the student outcome. Colorado and Kansas reported that they would be

collecting data for the 2006/07 school year using a student identification tracking system.

RESEARCH QUESTION 4: HOW ARE THE STATES CARRYING OUT SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES?

With a potential client base of more than 1 million students (Fleischman, 2004), the supplemental educational services provision of No Child Left Behind is a mammoth undertaking. To be successful, it will require the participation and cooperation of many organizations and levels of the education system. At the time of this preliminary review each of the three critical players—state education agencies, districts and schools, and parents—was falling short in moving toward program success. States are moving forward but with limited resources. Districts and schools play a key role in encouraging parents to participate, but they are not charged with resolving issues of access to providers or their effectiveness. Parent roles are yet to be fully studied. Future descriptive reports will shed more light on whether the three critical players' roles have been strengthened, if currently identified issues have been resolved, and if new issues have emerged.

No evaluative data were available from states at the time of the study to determine the effectiveness of the supplemental educational services providers

The roles of state education agencies are challenging

The No Child Left Behind Act lists six roles for state education agencies in implementing the supplemental educational services program (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2006):

1. Set criteria and standards for approving providers.
2. Identify, approve, and maintain a public list of providers.
3. Ensure that the list of approved providers includes organizations that are able to serve

students with disabilities and limited English proficiency.

4. Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of provider services.
5. Monitor district implementation of supplemental educational services.
6. Develop and apply policy criteria for withdrawing providers from state-approved list, including when a provider fails for two consecutive years to increase student proficiency in state academic content and achievement standards or fails to adhere to applicable health, safety, and civil rights requirements.

Each of the three critical players—state education agencies, districts and schools, and parents—was falling short in moving toward program success

The state agency contacts also described six key roles of state agencies in implementing supplemental educational services programs, many of them in terms similar to those listed in the law:

1. Consult with parents, teachers, and schools to promote participation by providers so that parents can have choices among supplemental educational services providers.
2. Recruit potential providers.
3. Develop application criteria for providers.
4. Maintain an updated list of approved providers.
5. Develop, implement, and publicly report on the standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of provider services.
6. Remove providers failing to show gains in the academic proficiency of students after two years.

Most states have not yet been able to adequately measure the impact of services on student achievement, a key state responsibility. State contacts point

to lack of staff capacity, financial resources, and expertise needed to develop a database to accurately collect and report data to assist them in monitoring and evaluating student progress. While three states (Colorado, Missouri, and South Dakota) are developing individual student databases, adding information from the district about which provider is serving each student and the amount of participation by each student could prove challenging.

The roles of districts and schools as liaisons between other key parties

While the role of districts was not a focus of this study, some information was available from the state contacts. School districts' responsibilities under No Child Left Behind (Supplemental educational services, 2005) are to:

1. Provide an easily understandable annual notice to parents identifying available providers and describing the enrollment process and timeline and the services, qualifications, and demonstrated effectiveness of each provider.
2. Help parents choose a provider, if requested.
3. Protect the privacy of students eligible for and receiving services.
4. Calculate and establish the per pupil allocation for supplemental educational services, if not determined by the state.
5. Determine which students should receive services if more students apply than can be served with available funds.
6. Enter into contracts with providers.
7. Ensure that eligible students with disabilities and eligible students with limited English proficiency may participate.
8. At the discretion of the state, become involved in collecting data from providers to assist state monitoring and evaluation activities.

The state contacts described the district responsibilities in these terms:

1. Identify students in Title I schools that are eligible for supplemental educational services.
2. Notify families at least once a year that their children qualify for supplemental educational services and provide families with information about approved providers.
3. Set aside 20 percent of Title I funds for supplemental educational services and school-choice transportation.
4. Assist families who seek help with assistance in choosing a provider.
5. Manage the contracts and pay the providers chosen by the families.
6. Work with providers to measure academic performance.

Again, these roles are very similar to those detailed in No Child Left Behind, except that the state contacts did not indicate that districts would be assisting them in collecting provider data, nor did they see districts as having a responsibility for protecting the privacy of students. They did note the need for districts to set aside funds and work with providers on measuring student achievement.

State agency contacts believe that schools were burdened by the administrative tasks related to the supplemental educational services program and that in some cases they were unresponsive to state requests for data. The state contacts also reported that districts expressed concerns that federal funds had not been made available to reimburse them for the administrative costs associated with implementing the law and that restrictions prevented using Title I funds to support administrative tasks.

The Center on Education Policy (2005a, b) reported that more than half the states did not have

sufficient funds to adequately fund supplemental educational services in 2005. The state contacts, when gathering information from their districts, learned that the program had not yet significantly

affected most school budgets. Inadequate funding could become more of an issue if more parents of eligible students choose supplemental services. In such cases the district is required to provide services first to students who need them most, based on state assessment scores. The state contacts also reported that no Central Region districts or schools had been forced to deny eligible students opportunities for supplemental educational services during the 2004/05 school year.

Most states have not yet been able to adequately measure the impact of services on student achievement, a key state responsibility

The roles of parents are not yet being fully realized

Under the No Child Left Behind Act parents of students eligible for supplemental educational services are able to choose a provider for their child from the state-approved provider list. Although parents can request the assistance of their local school, parents make the final decision. The act seeks to involve parents as active participants in three ways:

1. At the state level a group of parents must be consulted in developing criteria for identifying providers.
2. Parents are given responsibility for choosing a state-approved provider for their child.
3. Parents work with the school district and the provider to develop and identify specific academic achievement goals for their child.

In addition, parents must also ensure that their child attends and participates appropriately in the supplemental services sessions. State agency contacts reported that districts indicate to them that parents are not choosing to enroll their children in supplemental educational services because of confusion

Inadequate funding could become more of an issue if more parents of eligible students choose supplemental services

about the program, lack of trust in the program, and logistics difficulties (transportation problems, lack of technology, and so on). These reports need to be verified by directly surveying parents.

(and school-choice transportation). Contacts also expressed concerns that the program might result in the transfer of Title I funds to supplemental educational services providers that would do less to improve student achievement than hiring a “highly qualified” teacher in every classroom.

RESEARCH QUESTION 5: WHAT ARE THE ISSUES AND CONCERNS FOR THE CENTRAL REGION STATES IN IMPLEMENTING SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES?

State agency contacts were asked to list the major impediments to the success of supplemental educational services in their states. These impediments were then analyzed and categorized as funding, flexibility, and cross-level relationship concerns.

None of the impediments are insurmountable, but overcoming them will require clear intent to achieve success and the flexibility to adjust to differences in state and local situations. Resources will continue to be a concern, and guidance on prioritizing responses to the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act is needed. Of greater concern is how to adapt the details of the supplemental educational services program so that rural schools can also provide services to all their eligible students.

Concerns about funding

State contacts were very concerned that schools might need to end programs and services previously funded by Title I to fund the supplemental educational services program. They feared that schools with high supplemental educational services participation rates would not be able to hire reading specialists and other special teachers early in the school year to support all students’ needs because the funds might be needed later to cover supplemental educational services for eligible students. These concerns were expressed despite the cap of 20 percent of district Title I funds expected to be set aside for the supplemental educational services program

Concerns about flexibility

Some state contacts were very concerned that the supplemental educational services portion of No Child Left Behind needed more flexibility if states were to implement it successfully. Rural areas, in particular, were struggling with rules that they believe prevented their districts and schools from receiving services by prohibiting the districts from providing the services themselves. A school district may apply to be a supplemental educational services provider as long as the district as a whole has not been identified for improvement under the No Child Left Behind Act—and even then, a district may apply for a waiver permitting it to provide services to its own schools. In some cases, however, the districts did not seek—or were encouraged not to seek—a waiver.

Concerns about cross-level relationships

State contacts expressed concerns about inadequate collaboration among districts, schools, and providers. They believed that collaboration could work out several logistical problems. The relationship between the state and the districts was strained, with districts reporting being overwhelmed by administrative loads. State contacts wanted the U.S. Department of Education to be much more prescriptive about the development of processes for monitoring and evaluating the providers.

NOTES

1. States use their own assessments and criteria for determining adequate yearly progress. The total numbers of schools and districts vary across states.

2. Wyoming did not yet have any schools eligible for supplemental educational services and therefore had not yet provided information to the Center on Innovation and Improvement directory of supplemental educational services.
3. State contacts reported that it took 25 percent of their time in Colorado, 30 percent in Kansas, 100 percent in Missouri, 5 percent in Nebraska, 20 percent in North Dakota, 10 percent in South Dakota, and 10 percent in Wyoming.

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The data sources for this report included online databases and interviews with the principal state education agency staff member responsible for the state's supplemental educational services program for each of the seven states in the Central Region. These state contacts were the Title I director (in three states), the federal program coordinator (two states), an educational program specialist (one state), and the supplemental educational services coordinator (one state). Responsible state education agency staff members spent from 10 percent to 100 percent of their time on supplemental educational services responsibilities.

For the 2004/05 school year 52 districts, 131 schools, and 47,065 students were eligible for supplemental educational services; there were 164 supplemental educational services providers. Eligible students were identified as students receiving free and reduced price lunch and attending Title I schools that are required to offer supplemental educational services. Data reported on web sites often differed from source to source. Information on the number of eligible schools and districts was verified and adjusted through interviews with the state agency contacts.

Data collection

Data on the supplemental educational services programs of each of the seven states were first collected from web sites. These included the Center on Innovation and Improvement (www.centerii.org), one of the new content centers of the Comprehensive Centers program of the U.S. Department of Education, and the Supplemental Educational Services Quality Center (www.tutorsforkids.org), established through a grant to the American Institutes for Research from the Office of Innovation and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education. If the national databases did not contain the names of the schools in School Improvement II status—schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress for three consecutive years and thus must

offer supplemental educational services—state web sites (www.cde.state.co.us; www3.ksde.org; www.dese.state.mo.us; www.dpi.state.nd.us; www.nde.ne.us; www.doe.sd.gov; www.k12.wy.us) were used to obtain the data. School status was then verified with the state contacts.

Characteristics (school size, community size, demographic data, and so on) were then collected for those schools from the National Center for Education Statistics database and summarized before calls were made to the state agency contacts. The researcher then verified the summarized information during the phone interviews with the state contacts. The name of the state contact was first obtained through the national or state web site and then verified at the outset of the interview. State agency contacts are responsible for communicating with the identified schools and collecting data from them. The roles of the state contacts varied in scope and time, partly in relation to the number of schools on the list and partly according to state resources allocated.

The interviewer asked to speak with the person named on the web site or the one responsible for the supplemental educational services program in the state, if different. The telephone interviews sought first to resolve discrepancies between the list of schools published nationally and the list on the state web site or the list kept by the contact. The researcher then revised the lists based on the interviews. The revised lists were used in describing the common characteristics included in the report.

Once the list of schools had been verified, the number of eligible students for each school was determined by noting the number of students on free and reduced price lunch. The number of eligible students reported here may be an underestimate because not all low-income students sign up for free and reduced price lunch. While schools have additional means of identifying these students, such as examining welfare rolls and the records of younger siblings who may not be as sensitive to the stigma of being on free and reduced price lunch

lists, such efforts are not always successful. Finally, since states are required to report the number of eligible and participating students to the Department of Education, the state agency contacts were able to supply the number of students receiving supplemental services.

Data analysis

Data obtained in the interviews were compared with data obtained on web sites, including the

number of schools needing improvement and the number of students eligible for supplemental services. Content analysis methods were used to analyze information gathered on supplemental educational services providers from web sites and state agency contacts, including the process used to recruit and validate them and perceptions about the results achieved during the report year. The practices used by states to evaluate and monitor the providers, as well as implementation issues with programs in each state, were also analyzed.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

State: _____

State contact: _____

Phone number: _____

Topics for state education agencies

1. Students: we are trying to determine the number of students who should have access to these services versus the number that actually use the services
2. Provider: we are trying to determine the characteristics of the supplemental educational services (SES) providers in each state and whether or not your various schools have access to these providers
3. Evaluation of providers: we are trying to determine how best to evaluate these services once a parent decides to choose a particular provider
4. Successful practices/stories: we are hoping to find some success stories in the seven states
5. Issues/concerns: and lastly we are hoping to determine what the common problems and issues are that revolve around the state's trying to meet the intent of the law as it relate to SES providers.

Interview questions

Students

Demographic data of schools/districts in your state that were on the list in 2004-2005

1. This is what I have learned from both your website and the federal websites with regard to your schools in the 2004-2005 school year with regard to AYP schools. These schools

were in the second year of reporting and met the criteria which required them to offer supplemental educational services. Do I have the correct information?

- number of districts in the second year of AYP needing assistance,
 - number of schools in the second year of AYP needing assistance,
 - number of SES providers approved by your state.
2. I am assuming that you use "free and reduced" to select those students who would be eligible for the SES services. Is this correct? I find that you had only _____ schools on the list that were Title I schools.
 - Does your office require that they report this in a specific way? If so, how are you doing that and then reporting that information?
 - Do you have the data for the 2004–2005 school year?
 - Can you give me the number of children who are actually signing up for the SES services? Do you know about what percent that is of the total that have options for SES or choice?
 - How about the number of children who are opting for choice?
 - If the number I mentioned above does not appear correct, can you tell me why you thin the numbers are so different? Are districts that are already having budgeting issues with NCLB re-defining/limiting the population they can serve?
- Can you share the average amount of funding that schools are spending per child on SES in the schools that are affected?
 - What are your challenges in this area? What could help you do a better, more efficient job in this area?

Providers

1. This is the information that I found relative to the providers in your state:
 - Number of SES providers approved by your state _____
 - Common characteristics _____
2. Do you have any trouble recruiting providers in your state or in certain areas? Can you tell me how most of your providers are obtained?
3. What limitations have you placed on funds to be spent per child for the providers? i.e. Hourly rate: total amount per year?
4. Do you have success stories you can share which point to the effectiveness of the SES providers?
5. Do you have an LEA where you had to provide an exemption for SES because they did not have access to approved providers?
6. Can you tell me how are the providers are meeting the intent that their work be tied to your state standards?
7. Do you know how well the various providers are working with the schools in order to coordinate their work with that of the regular classroom teacher? Is this portion of the law difficult to monitor?
8. Are you aware of any LEA where you have had to provide an exemption for SES because they did not have access to approved providers?
9. Are there any districts that have had to deny eligible students funding for SES? To be more specific districts are forced, because of budgeting constraints, to devise a plan which provides SES services that are the lowest achieving out of a group of students who are SES eligible?
10. Overall, how would you rate the services of your SES providers in your state? On a scale from 10-1 with 10 being the very high and 1 being very low
11. Why do you think that parents are not electing to use the SES providers for their children?

Evaluation of providers

1. Do you consider the monitoring of the various SES providers as a challenge? To what degree would you say *not at all, low, moderate, high degree*? Could you elaborate on why or why not?
2. I have a few areas of the SES provider evaluation that I would like to have your input with regard to the level of challenge represented by the component? We will use the following levels as it relates to the amount of challenge this component causes you and your state in terms of implementation.

Component	1*	2*	3*	4*
Implementing a system for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of supplemental education service providers				
Determining whether provider provides services are effective in raising student achievement				
Determining whether providers' instructional methods are research based				
Determining whether provider applicants' instructional strategies are of high quality				

Component	1*	2*	3*	4*
Determining whether provider' services are consistent with the instructional program of the school district and with state academic content standards				
Ensuring that the locations and capacity of service providers are adequate to fill local needs				
Determining whether the provider is financially sound				
Providing guidance for prospective providers about pricing or location of services				
Encouraging providers to apply for approval				
Developing provider selection criteria				

*1: no challenge 2: minimal challenge 3: moderate challenge 4: serious challenge

3. What are some of the difficulties you and your districts have encountered while trying to implement this portion of the NCLB with regard to SES monitoring and evaluation?

- The Center on Education Policy reported that over 50 percent of the states indicated that there were not funds sufficient to adequately fund the SES in 2005. How would you report out your state?

4. Is your state handling the evaluation of the providers internally, or are you contracting out that evaluation to others?
5. Do you have success stories you can share which point to the effectiveness of SES with regard to student learning?
6. How are you measuring success rates of school districts that are required to have SES? Providers? What specific components are you using—test date, etc.? Or do you measure success rates of those districts differently than others? Is there a document that you would share?
7. Have you refused approval of services for a SES after their evaluation?

8. This same study reported that the majority of the states would rather see SES be the first intervention prior to school choice. What would be your state's position on a change where SES became the first intervention prior to requiring school choice? Did your state apply to the federal Department of Education to offer SES prior to choice?

Issues/concerns

1. In terms of your responsibilities at the state level and your job title, what percent of the time can you (and potentially others) devote to the implementation of this portion of the law?
2. What types of information sources do you have to assist you in getting your job done in this area? Where do you go to get help?
3. What do you see as the major issues/concerns that need to be addressed before this portion of the law can be fully developed in your state?
4. If you could make improvements to this entire process, what would you specifically do?

REFERENCES

- Center on Education Policy. (2005a, June). *Middle schools are increasingly targeted for improvement*. Retrieved July 16, 2006, from <http://www.cep-dc.org/nclb/NCLB-PolicyBriefs2005/CEPPB/web.pdf>.
- Center on Education Policy. (2005b, June). *Urban schools are tagged for improvement at higher rates than suburban or rural schools*. Retrieved July 16, 2006, from <http://www.cep-dc.org/nclb/NCLBPolicyBriefs2005/CEPPB/web.pdf>.
- Center on Education Policy. (2006, March). *From the capital to the classroom: Year four report of the No Child Left Behind Act*. Retrieved July 16, 2006, from <http://www.cep-dc.org/nclb/Year4/CEP-NCLB-Report-4.pdf>.
- Center on Innovation and Improvement. (2006, July). Directory of state contacts and web links: Supplemental education services. Retrieved July 24, 2006, from <http://www.centerii.org/ses.html>.
- Christie, K. (2005, May). *State student information systems* (Education Commission of the States Report 6139). Retrieved August 26, 2006, from <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/6139/6139.htm>.
- Fleischman, S. (2004). *The role of education technology in meeting the promise of supplemental education services* (White Paper, U.S. Department of Education Secretary's No Child Left Behind Leadership Summit). Retrieved July 20, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/os/technology/plan/2004/site/documents/Fleischman-RoleofEducationalTechnology.pdf>.
- Fuller, B. (2006, July 26). Education department expands tutoring. *Associated Press*. Retrieved July 28, 2006, from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/07/26/AR20060726031474_2.html.
- Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (2004, February). *Evaluating supplemental educational service providers: issues and challenges*. Retrieved July 24, 2006, from <http://www.nwrel.org/planning/reports/esesp/>.
- Stullich, S., Eisner, E., McCrary, J., & Roney, C. (2006). *National assessment of Title I interim report: Volume I: Implementation of Title I*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005, June). *Supplemental education services, non-regulatory guidelines*. Retrieved July 21, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/suppsvcsguid.doc>.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2006, April). *Improving data quality for Title I standards, assessments, and accountability reporting: Guidelines for states, LEAs, and schools (non-regulatory guidance)*. Retrieved September 8, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/standardsassessment/nclbdataguidance.pdf>.
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2004, September). *Improvements needed in Education's process for tracking states' implementation of key provisions* (Report #GAO-04-734). Retrieved August 24, 2006, from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d04734.pdf>.
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2006, August). *No Child Left Behind Act: Education actions needed to improve local implementation and state evaluation of supplemental education services* (Report GAO-06-758). Retrieved August 23, 2006, from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06758.pdf#search=%22GAO%20report%20Supplemental%20educational%20services%22>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Federation of Teachers. (2003, October). *Facts about supplemental education services required by the No Child Left Behind Act*. Retrieved July 16, 2006, from <http://www.aft.org/topics/nclb/downloads/SuppServFacts.pdf>.
- Education Commission of the States (n.d.). 50 State map database. Retrieved July 27, 2006, from <http://nclb2ecs.org/NCLBSURVEY/nclb.aspx?Target=SM>.
- Spellings, M. (2005, November) No Child Left Behind: A road map for state implementation. Retrieved July 13, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/roadmap/roadmap.doc>.
- Sunderman, G.L., Kim, J.S., & Orfield, G. (2005). *NCLB meets school realities: lessons from the field*. California: Corwin Press.
- Supplemental Educational Services Quality Center. (n.d.). Title I schools required to provide supplemental education services. Retrieved June 20, 2006, from <http://www.tutorsforkids.org/SESRequiredStates.asp>.